

Serial No. 10/826,236  
August 11, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated March 16, 2005  
Page 6 of 9

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 15-17.

Claims 1-3 and 5-17 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-13 in co-pending Application No. 10/788,008. Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 15-17 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite.

Co-pending Application No. 10/788,008 was expressly abandoned on April 6, 2005. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the provisional rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17 have been amended to set forth process steps. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of Claims 15-17 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu (U.S. 5,033,377). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"A photogravure press, with which paste films are formed on a substrate sheet by gravure printing, the photogravure press comprising:

a gravure roll having image areas on a circumferential surface thereof and having print paste applied thereon so as to form the paste films; and

an impression cylinder facing the gravure roll having the substrate sheet sandwiched therebetween; wherein

**a printing direction corresponds to a direction in which the gravure roll and impression cylinder rotate;**

Serial No. 10/826,236

August 11, 2005

Reply to the Office Action dated March 16, 2005

Page 7 of 9

**in each image area, printing-direction walls extending in substantially the printing direction and perpendicular walls extending substantially perpendicularly to the printing-direction walls are disposed, and a plurality of cells are defined by the printing-direction walls and the perpendicular walls; and**

**in order for the adjacent cells to communicate with each other, each of the perpendicular walls has substantially perpendicular cuts formed therein.” (emphasis added)**

Support for this amendment can be found on pages 7 and 8 and Figs. 1 and 4 of the originally filed specification. With the unique combination of features and elements recited in Applicant's claim 1, Applicant has been able to provide a photogravure press where the conductive paste flows not only smoothly between the adjacent cells but also uniformly in the printing direction. This prevents so-called stringiness of the conductive paste which would otherwise occur when a substrate sheet is detached from a gravure roll with adjacent cells arranged at an angle with the printing direction. Thus, local irregularities are prevented from occurring in the peripheral portion of the printed conductive paste films.

The Examiner alleged that Shimizu teaches in Fig. 6 a plurality of printing direction walls extending in the printing direction. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Shimizu discloses in each of prior art Figs. 2A and 4-7 walls that extend at an angle relative to the printing direction. In particular, Fig. 7 shows the walls extending at an angle relative to the printing direction wherein the printing direction is directly opposite the “INK FLOW” indicated in the figure. Also, column 3, lines 1-9 of Shimizu teaches that “the ink flows to a direction opposite to the rotation of the rotary press.” The rotation direction of the rotary press is the printing direction in the invention of Shimizu. Furthermore, Shimizu also shows in Fig. 10 walls extending at an angle to the printing direction “A”. Shimizu explicitly teaches in

Serial No. 10/826,236  
August 11, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated March 16, 2005  
Page 8 of 9

column 6, lines 27-28 that the printing direction "A" is at an angle between 15° to 25° with respect to the walls. Thus, Shimizu clearly does not teach or suggest printing-direction walls extending in substantially the printing direction. In fact, Shimizu clearly teaches away from such an arrangement of the walls because Shimizu teaches that the walls must be extending at an angle relative to the printing direction.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-17 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Serial No. 10/826,236  
August 11, 2005  
Reply to the Office Action dated March 16, 2005  
Page 9 of 9

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP  
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
Telephone: (703) 385-5200  
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080